

REMARKS

The outstanding Office Action of August 28, 2009, rejected all pending claims 21-31. Applicants have amended claims 21, 25, 27, and 29. As such, claims 21-31 are pending, of which claims 21, 25, 27, and 29 are independent. Applicants request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Wright for participating in the interview held on November 19, 2009, in which Stephen Schaefer (Reg. No. 37,927) and Kristen Hansen (undersigned) participated on behalf of Applicants. A proposed amendment to claim 21 and references cited against claim 21 in the outstanding Action were discussed. The Examiner indicated that if the Applicants made amendments that made a distinction between the content used in an access request in the present application and the content used in the Rezaiifar reference, that the present application would be distinguished over the reference. Applicants appreciate the input provided by the Examiner and have taken that into account in further refining the amendment of claim 21 discussed in the interview. As such, further amendment to claim 21 is included in the amendment of claim 21 above. Applicants submit that claim 21 now clearly defines subject matter that is patentable over the references of record, and invite the Examiner to discuss the claim further with Applicants' representatives if the Examiner feels that would be helpful in advancing prosecution on the merits.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenberg (International Pub. No. WO 01/13666) in view of Rezaiifar (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0055964).

Without conceding the correctness of the rejections and in order to advance prosecution on the merits, Applicants have amended independent claims 21, 25, 27, and 29 to define more particularly the subject matter sought to be patented. The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments appear in the specification as originally filed, for example, in

originally presented claims 21, 25, 27, and 29 and at Figures 1-2 and the accompanying textual description (e.g., paragraphs 0060-0070).

Applicants' claim 21 is directed to obtaining authorized access to multiple different entities (e.g., service providers) with a single access request having two distinct sets of data (e.g., a first set for a first entity and a second set for a second entity). Applicants submit that claim 21, as amended is directed to subject matter that is patentable over Stenberg and Rezaiifar. For example, neither Stenberg nor Rezaiifar disclose or suggest, as recited in Applicants' claim 21, as amended, "a distinct set of data for each of a first entity and a second entity for authenticating the user to both the first and the second entities of the network is calculated using at least one predefined cryptographic algorithm applied to the random number received and at least one secret key specific to the user, wherein the distinct set of data comprises (i) a first password for the first entity and (ii) a second password for the second entity,"

The Examiner relied upon the Stenberg reference as teaching receiving authentication parameters (claim 16; pg. 18, lines 13-15). However, the Stenberg reference does not include parameters that are calculated to include "a distinct set of data for each of a first entity and a second entity for authenticating the user to both the first and the second entities of the network" wherein "the distinct set of data comprises (i) a first password for the first entity and (ii) a second password for the second entity," as recited in Applicants amended independent claims. In addition, the Stenberg reference does not employ an access request that includes "first user identifier data and second user identifier data for identifying the user to said first and second entities of the network and the two distinct sets of data.

Rezaiifar is directed to "a method and apparatus for authorizing an access terminal (AT) requesting a service provided by an entity in an access network..." (Abstract). The Examiner relied upon the Rezaiifar reference as teaching the use of a set of data inserted into a request for purposes of sender identification in a service access request [para. 0040]. As described in paragraph [0040], Rezaiifar indeed includes the capability to request a service by generating and sending a service query. The service query includes a source address, a destination address, and capabilities of an access terminal necessary for determining which service will be provided.

Nowhere in Rezaiifar is there discussed user identifier information combined with two distinct sets of data for authenticating a user to both a first and second entity of a network. Accordingly, similar to Stenberg above, Rezaiifar also does not teach or suggest employing an access request that includes “first user identifier data and second user identifier data for identifying the user to said first and second entities of the network and the two distinct sets of data.”

Because Stenberg and Rezaiifar, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 21, they cannot render claim 21 obvious. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 21.

Claims 25, 27, and 29 contain features that are similar, but not identical to the features described above for claim 21, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 21. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 25, 27, and 29.

Claims 22-24, 26, and 28, 30, and 31 are variously dependent on claims 21, 25, 27, and 29 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 21, 25, 27, and 29. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 22-24, 26, and 28, 30, and 31.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 21-31 are in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Transy et al.
Serial No. : 10/565,571
Filed : August 2, 2006
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney Docket No.:18394-007US1/RVL/PA61423US

No fees are believed due at this time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2009

/Kristen J. Hansen/

Kristen J. Hansen

Reg. No. 63,526

Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza
60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

60608659.doc